IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1248 OF 2005

Ratnam Sudesh Iyer ...Petitioner

Versus

Sajid Nadiadwala & Ors ...Respondents

.....

Mr. Amit Desai, Advocate for Petitioner

Mr. Shailesh Kantharia, Advocate for Respondent No.1.

.....

CORAM: SMT. V.K. TAHILRAMANI, J.

DATED: 15TH JULY, 2005

P. C.:-

1. Heard both sides.

2. The petitioner has prayed for quashing of process issued against him in Criminal Case No. 78/SS/2003 now pending before the 44th Court at Andheri, Mumbai being erstwhile Case No. 420/SS/2003 before the 22nd Court at Andheri. In the said case, process has been issued against the petitioner under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

3. For the reasons recorded in my order dated 13th June, 2005 passed in Criminal Writ Petition No.213 of 2005 and order dated 21st June, 2005 passed in Criminal Application No.550 of 2005, the petitioner

has an efficacious remedy of preferring revision against the order of Magistrate issuing process. Hence, in my opinion, it would be appropriate that the petitioner prefers revision before the concerned Sessions Court against the order of the Magistrate issuing process.

4. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to prefer revision before the concerned Sessions Court. The learned advocate for the petitioner states that the necessary revision would be preferred within a period of four weeks from today. In view of this statement, the trial Court shall not proceed with the trial for a period of four weeks from today. The learned advocate for the respondent i.e. original complainant fairly states that no objection would be raised in respect of delay in filing revision before the learned Sessions Judge.

5. On the necessary revision being preferred by the petitioner before the concerned Sessions Court, the concerned Sessions Court shall dispose of the same on merits after hearing necessary parties.

6. Writ Petition is disposed of.

*****